

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-14 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 were amended, claim 15 was added and claim 5 was cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-4 and 5-15 are at issue.

I. Objection To Claims

Claim 5 has been amended as directed by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this objection and request its withdrawal.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Indefiniteness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 1, 7 and 10 have been clarified per Examiner's suggestion. Claim 5 has been cancelled, and is therefore moot. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

III. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-10, 12, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rose et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,709). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a content distribution system for performing content transaction management, comprising: a plurality of user devices among which the content transaction management allows a content to be secondarily distributed; a secure container containing the content encrypted by a content key, and container information including conditions set for a transaction of the content; a first section for distributing the content by transmitting said secure container; and a second section for performing person authentication.

When said secure container is transmitted among said plurality of user devices, based on a person identification certificate (hereinafter, simply referred to as an IDC) which is identified in reference to an IDC identifier list, The container information includes the IDC identifier list as a list of the IDCs. The IDC identifier list is generated by a person identification authority (hereinafter, simply referred to as an IDA) as a third party agent and stores a template serving as person identification data of a target user for the content transaction. A secure container distributing device among said plurality of user devices is configured to compare sampling information input by a user with the template stored in the IDC identified in reference to the IDC identifier list, to process person authentication of a user of a receiving device among said plurality of user devices, to which the secure container is to be distributed, and to perform a process of distribution of the content key for decrypting the content stored in said secure container, when the comparison result is affirmative.

Rose is directed to a system and method for managing the distribution of licensed application programs stored on a server over a distributed computer system. (See Abstract). The server compares predetermined program access restrictions for the Application Program with client computer access privileges and determines whether predetermined access conditions are satisfied by the requesting client computer. The server determines whether the client privileges satisfy Application Program access requirements. The access requirements in the preferred embodiment are (A) ownership of a valid license for the Application Builder by the user or associated client computer, (B) receipt of the user's Application Builder public encryption key from the user's Application Builder, and (C) explicit user acceptance of the licensing terms for the trial version of the selected Application Program. (See Col. 7, lines 26-39).

Rose does not disclose or suggest a secure container distributing device configured to compare sampling information input by a user with the template stored in the IDC identified in reference to the IDC identifier list. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-14, which dependent from claim 1, are allowable over Rose. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Rose does not disclose or suggest a secure container distributing device configured to compare sampling information input by a user with the template stored in the IDC identified in reference to the IDC identifier list, as required by claim 1. Thus, claims 11 and 13, which depend from claim 1, are also allowable over Rose. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2005

By: 

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000